



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/524,849	03/14/2000	Esme M. Taylor	853.02	8171

8685 7590 09/06/2007

DERGOSITS & NOAH LLP  
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 1450  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

EXAMINER
----------

NGUYEN, CHAU T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/06/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/524,849

**Applicant(s)**

TAYLOR, ESME M.

**Examiner**

Chau Nguyen

**Art Unit**

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-11,31-50,71-74 and 79-90 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2, 4-11, 31-50, 71-74 and 79-90 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 06/18/2007 has been entered. Claims 1-2, 4-11, 31-50, 71-74 and 79-90 are presented for examination.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-2, 4-11, 31-50, 71-74 and 79-90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims 1, 32, 71-74 and 79 contain subject matter "the associated sponsor's active and browseable pre-existing web page, wherein no further browsing is required to see the content of the sponsor web page" which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

4. Claims 1-2, 4-11, 31-50, 71-74 and 79-90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim claims 1, 32, 71-74 and 79 contain subject matter "the associated sponsor's active and browseable pre-existing web page, wherein no further browsing is required to see the content of the sponsor web page" which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 32-34, 36-38 and 73-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lambert et al. (Lambert), US Patent No. 6,374,241.

7. As to independent claims 32 and 73-74, Lambert discloses a method for selecting and viewing a directory listing over a computer network comprising:

receiving a search request from a user (Abstract: processing a user query request);

presenting a listing to the user based on the search request (Figs. 13&14 and col. 9, line 57 – col.10, line 17: Fig. 13 shows a user interface screen for user to perform a data query or search for specified categories/criteria, and Fig. 13 shows a plurality of listings based on the user's search; Figure 15 shows listing "Shoes-Custom Made" has associated sponsor "Shop Online for Computer" or "March Calendar Free Postcards", or "Consumer Guide"); and

transmitting listee information, URL information of a sponsor for displaying a browseable pre-existing web page concurrently with the listing (Fig. 14 shows listee information 1862, sponsor information on the right hand side such as "Shop Online for Computers", "Consumer Guide", etc...are displayed to the user; Fig. 15 and col. 10, lines 1-17: when the user selects listing "Shoe-Custom Made" on Fig. 14, Fig. 15 displays the selected listing "Shoe-Custom Made" and sponsors such as "Hanger Prosthetics & Orthotics" and "Pedi-Mac Shoe Company" which are active and browseable pre-existing HTML web page having sponsors (embedded hypertext links) on the same page as the sponsoree listing, advertisements such as "Shop Online for Computers", "March Calendar Free Postcards", "Consumer Guide" are displayed at the same time with the listing "Shoes-Custom Made").

8. As to dependent claim 33, Lambert discloses wherein the listee information includes contact information related to the listee (Fig. 15).

Art Unit: 2176

9. As to dependent claim 34, Lambert discloses wherein the sponsor information includes a Universal Resource Indicator (URI) (Fig. 15).

10. As to dependent claim 36, Lambert discloses wherein the sponsor information includes multi-media objects (Advertisements include multimedia objects are well-known in the art).

11. As to dependent claim 37, Lambert discloses wherein the framing information frames the listee information in a web page and the sponsor information in an HTML frame (Fig. 15).

12. As to dependent claim 38, Lambert discloses wherein sponsor information may be navigated by the user (Fig. 15).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 1, 10-11, 31, 79 and 88-90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert et al. (Lambert), US Patent No. 6,374,241 and further in view of Reilly et al. (Reilly), US Patent No. US 2002/0026349.

15. As to independent claims 1 and 79, Lambert discloses a method for selecting and viewing a directory listing over a computer network comprising:

receiving a search request from a user (Abstract: processing a user query request);

presenting a plurality of directory listings to the user based on the search request wherein each of the listings has an associated sponsor (Figs. 13&14 and col. 9, line 57 – col.10, line 17: Fig. 13 shows a user interface screen for user to perform a data query or search for specified categories/criteria, and Fig. 13 shows a plurality of listings based on the user's search; Figure 15 shows listing "Shoes-Custom Made" has associated sponsor "Shop Online for Computer" or "March Calendar Free Postcards", or "Consumer Guide");

receiving a user's selection of one of the directory listings (col. 10, lines 1-17: the user may select one of the plurality listings such as selection by using a mouse of listing "custom made shoes");

displaying the directory listing selected by the user concurrently with associated sponsor's active and browseable pre-existing web page (Fig. 14 shows listee information 1862, sponsor information on the right hand side such as "Shop Online for Computers", "Consumer Guide", etc...are displayed to the user; Fig. 15 and col. 10,

Art Unit: 2176

lines 1-17: when the user selects listing "Shoe-Custom Made" on Fig. 14, Fig. 15 displays the selected listing "Shoe-Custom Made" and sponsors such as "Hanger Prosthetics & Orthotics" and "Pedi-Mac Shoe Company" which are active and browseable pre-existing HTML web page having sponsors (embedded hypertext links) on the same page as the sponsoree listing, advertisements such as "Shop Online for Computers", "March Calendar Free Postcards", "Consumer Guide" are displayed at the same time with the listing "Shoes-Custom Made");

However, Lambert does not explicitly disclose wherein no further browsing is required to see a content of the web page.

Reilly discloses advertisement image is selected on the basis of the information category associated with the news item being viewed, and the advertisement shown in the data viewer screen is changed every time the subscriber clicks on a different category button (page 8, paragraph [0094]), thus this implies that each advertisement is associated with each information category (listing). Reilly also discloses in Figure 10 that the information category is displayed concurrently with the advertisement 258, and the user can see the content of the advertisement 258, and thus this would imply that the user does not need to further browse the advertisement.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Reilly with Lambert to include no further browsing is required to see a content of the web page. Reilly suggests that displaying advertisements associated with each category at the same time that new



stories associated with same category are displayed, thereby providing a “targeted” audience for advertisers.

16. As to dependent claims 10 and 88, Lambert and Reilly disclose displaying a licensee’s data if the user connected to the directory from a licensee (Lambert, Fig. 22).

17. As to dependent claims 11 and 89, Lambert, however, does not explicitly disclose tracking the user for data mining purposes.

Reilly discloses the category profiler in each category presents a category profile dialog to the subscriber to determine the subscriber’s interest in receiving information relating to the particular subcategories which may relate to specific companies, geographic regions, specific sports and sports teams (page 4, paragraph [0051]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Reilly and Lambert to include tracking the user for data mining purposes. Reilly suggests that by tracking the user such based on demographics and/or user’s interest so the right advertisement will be delivered to the user.

18. As to dependent claims 31 and 90, Lambert and Reilly disclose wherein sponsor information may be navigated by the user (Lambert, Figs 16-18).

19. Claims 2 and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert et al. (Lambert), US Patent No. 6,374,241 in view of Reilly et al. (Reilly), US Patent No. US 2002/0026349, and further in view of Kreiner et al. (Kreiner), US Patent No. 6,295,526.

20. As to dependent claims 2 and 81, Lambert and Reilly, however, do not explicitly disclose displaying the plurality of results on the single page, with no sponsors web page.

In the same field of endeavor, Kreiner discloses in Figure 2D and col. 12, lines 16-23 that the search provides a result of listing information about various Marriott Hotels without any advertisements or sponsors displaying on the same page of the result of listing information.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kreiner with Lambert and Reilly to include displaying the plurality of results on the single page, with no sponsors web page for the purpose of quickly performing a search for information and enhancing the response time.

21. Claims 4, 71-72, 80 and 82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert et al. (Lambert), US Patent No. 6,374,241 in view of Reilly et al. (Reilly), US Patent No. US 2002/0026349, and further in view of Davis et al. (Davis), US Patent No. US 6,269,361.

22. As to dependent claims 4 and 82, Lambert and Reilly disclose listee webpage that is independently and concurrently displayed with the directory listing (Lambert, col. 10, lines 1-17 and Fig. 15: displaying the listing that the user selected, advertisements such as "Shop Online for Computers", "March Calendar Free Postcards", "Consumer Guide" are displayed at the same time with the listing "Shoes-Custom Made"). However, Lambert and Reilly do not explicitly disclose providing a listee of the directory with the exclusive right to select a listee webpage that replaces the sponsor's web page.

Davis discloses the network information provider influences the position for a search listing through a continuous online competitive bidding process, the bidding process occurs when the network information provider enters a new bid amount for a search listing, and a higher bid by a network information provider will result in a more advantageous placement (replaces the sponsor's web page) (Abstract). Thus, by entering a new bid, this implies that the network information provider has the exclusive right to bid to a position in the search result.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Davis with Lambert and Reilly to include providing a listee of the directory with the exclusive right to select a listee webpage that replaces the sponsor's web page for the purpose of enabling advertisers to target web search terms relevant to their business and to pinpoint the placement of their web site description within the search results and thus providing a powerful advantage to businesses and others seeking to increase their web exposure.

Art Unit: 2176

23. As to independent claims 71-72 and 80, Lambert discloses a system for selecting and viewing a directory listing over a computer network comprising:

means for receiving a search request from a user (Abstract: processing a user query request);

means for presenting a plurality of directory listings to the user based on the search request wherein each of the listings has an associated sponsor (Figs. 13&14 and col. 9, line 57 – col.10, line 17: Fig. 13 shows a user interface screen for user to perform a data query or search for specified categories/criteria, and Fig. 13 shows a plurality of listings based on the user's search; Figure 15 shows listing "Shoes-Custom Made" has associated sponsor "Shop Online for Computer" or "March Calendar Free Postcards", or "Consumer Guide");

means for receiving a user's selection of one of the directory listings (col. 10, lines 1-17: the user may select one of the plurality listings such as selection by using a mouse of listing "custom made shoes");

means for displaying the directory listing selected by the user concurrently with associated sponsor's active and browseable pre-existing web page (Fig. 14 shows listee information 1862, sponsor information on the right hand side such as "Shop Online for Computers", "Consumer Guide", etc...are displayed to the user; Fig. 15 and col. 10, lines 1-17: when the user selects listing "Shoe-Custom Made" on Fig. 14, Fig. 15 displays the selected listing "Shoe-Custom Made" and sponsors such as "Hanger Prosthetics & Orthotics" and "Pedi-Mac Shoe Company" which are active and browseable pre-existing HTML web page having sponsors (embedded hypertext links)

on the same page as the sponsoree listing, advertisements such as "Shop Online for Computers", "March Calendar Free Postcards", "Consumer Guide" are displayed at the same time with the listing "Shoes-Custom Made");

However, Lambert does not explicitly disclose wherein no further browsing is required to see a content of the web page.

Reilly discloses advertisement image is selected on the basis of the information category associated with the news item being viewed, and the advertisement shown in the data viewer screen is changed every time the subscriber clicks on a different category button (page 8, paragraph [0094]), thus this implies that each advertisement is associated with each information category (listing). Reilly also discloses in Figure 10 that the information category is displayed concurrently with the advertisement 258, and the user can see the content of the advertisement 258, and thus this would imply that the user does not need to further browse the advertisement.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Reilly with Lambert to include no further browsing is required to see a content of the web page. Reilly suggests that displaying advertisements associated with each category at the same time that new stories associated with same category are displayed, thereby providing a "targeted" audience for advertisers.

Lambert and Reilly disclose listee webpage that is independently and concurrently displayed with the directory listing (Lambert, col. 10, lines 1-17 and Fig. 15: displaying the listing that the user selected, advertisements such as "Shop Online for

Computers", "March Calendar Free Postcards", "Consumer Guide" are displayed at the same time with the listing "Shoes-Custom Made"). However, Lambert and Reilly do not explicitly disclose providing a listee of the directory with the exclusive right to select a listee webpage that replaces the sponsor's web page.

Davis discloses the network information provider influences the position for a search listing through a continuous online competitive bidding process, the bidding process occurs when the network information provider enters a new bid amount for a search listing, and a higher bid by a network information provider will result in a more advantageous placement (replaces the sponsor's web page) (Abstract). Thus, by entering a new bid, this implies that the network information provider has the exclusive right to bid to a position in the search result.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Davis with Lambert and Reilly to include providing a listee of the directory with the exclusive right to select a listee webpage that replaces the sponsor's web page for the purpose of enabling advertisers to target web search terms relevant to their business and to pinpoint the placement of their web site description within the search results and thus providing a powerful advantage to businesses and others seeking to increase their web exposure.

24. Claims 5-9 and 83-87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert, Reilly and Davis as discussed in claims 4, 71-72, 80 and 82 above and further in view of Speicher, US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0049616.

25. As to dependent claims 5 and 83, Lambert and Reilly and Davis (Lambert-Reilly-Davis), however, do not explicitly disclose wherein, in said displaying step, the sponsoree listing is displayed with a “call now button” that automatically provides telephone communications between the user and a selected listee through an internet connection when the call now button is selected by the user.

Speicher discloses the advertiser has enabled the direct connection option, the Internet user is also presented with a “Direct Connect” button (“call now button”), and the Internet user initiates a telephone call to the advertiser by selecting the “Direct Connect” button (Fig. 14 and page 11, paragraph [0120]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Speicher with Lambert-Reilly-Davis to include the “call now button” automatically provides telephone communications between the user and a selected listee through an internet connection when the call now button is selected by the user for the purpose of enhancing communication between advertiser and user.

26. As to dependent claims 6 and 84, Lambert-Reilly-Davis and Speicher (Lambert-Reilly-Davis-Speicher) disclose wherein a call using the call now button is free to the user (It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to acknowledge that if the phone number is 1-800 number, then the call should be free for the user or if it is not a 1-800 number, then some party must pay for it).

Art Unit: 2176

27. As to dependent claims 7 and 85, Lambert-Reilly-Davis-Speicher disclose wherein the call may be charged to one of the following: the selected listee, the sponsor of the selected listee, or another sponsor (It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to acknowledge that if the phone number is 1-800 number, then the call should be free for the user or if it is not a 1-800 number, then some party must pay for it).

28. As to dependent claims 8 and 86, Lambert-Reilly-Davis-Speicher disclose playing an advertisement to the user prior to connecting the user with the selected listee (It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the acknowledge that playing an advertisement to the user prior to connecting the user with the selected listee for payment scheme such that when the user clicks on the ads, the advertiser pays for the user's access the ads, and these can be seen on CNN, Yahoo, MSN web sites, etc.,...).

29. As to dependent claims 9 and 87, Lambert-Reilly-Davis-Speicher disclose playing an advertisement to the listee prior to connecting the user with the selected listee (It's obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the acknowledge that playing an advertisement to the user prior to connecting the user with the selected listee for payment scheme such that when the user clicks on the ads, the advertiser pays for the user's access the ads, and these can be seen on CNN, Yahoo, MSN web sites, etc.,...).



30. Claims 35, 39-43 and 45-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert and further in view of Davis et al. (Davis), US Patent No. 6,269,361.

31. As to dependent claim 35, Lambert discloses listee webpage that is independently and concurrently displayed with the directory listing (Lambert, col. 10, lines 1-17 and Fig. 15: displaying the listing that the user selected, advertisements such as "Shop Online for Computers", "March Calendar Free Postcards", "Consumer Guide" are displayed at the same time with the listing "Shoes-Custom Made"). However, Lambert and Reilly do not explicitly disclose providing a listee of the directory with the exclusive right to select a listee webpage that replaces the sponsor's web page.

Davis discloses the network information provider influences the position for a search listing through a continuous online competitive bidding process, the bidding process occurs when the network information provider enters a new bid amount for a search listing, and a higher bid by a network information provider will result in a more advantageous placement (replaces the sponsor's web page) (Abstract). Thus, by entering a new bid, this implies that the network information provider has the exclusive right to bid to a position in the search result.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Davis with Lambert to include providing a listee of the directory with the exclusive right to select a listee webpage that replaces the sponsor's web page for the purpose of enabling advertisers to target web

Art Unit: 2176

search terms relevant to their business and to pinpoint the placement of their web site description within the search results and thus providing a powerful advantage to businesses and others seeking to increase their web exposure.

32. As to dependent claim 39, Lambert however does not explicitly disclose determining if a backer paying a higher impression price to sponsor the listee information wishes to sponsor the directory listing; and bumping the sponsor from sponsorship of the directory listing in favor of the backer paying a higher impression prices.

Davis discloses the network information provider influences the position for a search listing through a continuous online competitive bidding process, the bidding process occurs when the network information provider enters a new bid amount for a search listing, and a higher bid by a network information provider will result in a more advantageous placement (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Davis with Lambert to include determining if a backer paying a higher impression price to sponsor the listee information wishes to sponsor the directory listing; and bumping the sponsor from sponsorship of the directory listing in favor of the backer paying a higher impression prices for the purpose of enabling advertisers to target web search terms relevant to their business and to pinpoint the placement of their web site description within the

Art Unit: 2176

search results and thus providing a powerful advantage to businesses and others seeking to increase their web exposure.

33. As to dependent claim 40, Lambert and Davis disclose communicating accounting logic to bill the sponsor based upon impression criteria (Davis, col. 20, line 66 – col. 21, line 25).

34. As to dependent claim 41, Lambert and Davis disclose wherein the impression criteria includes the number of times the sponsor information is displayed (Davis, col. 20, line 66 – col. 21, line 25).

35. As to dependent claim 42, Lambert and Davis disclose wherein the impression criteria includes a billing period of time (Davis, col. 20, line 66 – col. 21, line 25).

36. As to dependent claim 43, Lambert and Davis disclose wherein the accounting logic provides a basis for which incentives are provided to the user (Davis, col. 20, line 66 – col. 21, line 25).

37. As to dependent claim 45, Lambert and Davis disclose a sponsor searching the directory listings to determine a category of listee available for sponsorship (Davis, col. 20, line 66 – col. 21, line 25).

38. As to dependent claim 46, Lambert and Davis disclose wherein the category of listee available for sponsorship includes at least one of zip code, city, user data, demographic, keyword, Standard Industrial Classification (SIC), or individual directory listing (Lambert, Fig. 15).

39. As to dependent claim 47, Lambert and Davis disclose providing a price quote to the sponsor of the category of listee available for sponsorship (Davis, col. 9, line 42 – col. 10, line 6).

40. As to dependent claim 48, Lambert and Davis disclose wherein the price quote is based upon the number of times the sponsor information is displayed (Davis, col. 20, line 66 – col. 21, line 25).

41. As to dependent claim 49, Lambert and Davis disclose wherein the price quote is based upon a billing period of time (Davis, col. 20, line 66 – col. 21, line 25).

42. As to dependent claim 50, Lambert and Davis disclose the sponsor entering an auction with other bidders if the sponsor declines the price quote (Davis, col. 5, line 53 – col. 6, line 15).

Art Unit: 2176

43. Claims 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert et al. (Lambert), US Patent No. 6,374,241 and further in view of Ramaswamy, US Patent No. 6,338,085.

44. As to dependent claim 44, Lambert however does not explicitly disclose transmitting call connection logic to the user to display a call connection option with a potential sponsor may communicate with the system.

Ramaswamy discloses a telephone activated web server providing a user interface for searching or requesting a certain information, and in response to the user's request, displaying a list of search result to the user, then the user selects one of the results such as "Good Eats Restaurant", the associated hypertext reference "GetRemote(17)" will be executed at the web server 100, the function GetRemote 360 accesses the database to determine the location of the reference identifier is shown as a telephone number followed by a file name "menu.html", the GetRemote function dial the telephone number and requests an upload of the file named "menu.html" (col. 3, line 6 – col. 5, line 17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ramaswamy and Lambert include disclose transmitting call connection logic to the user to display a call connection option with a potential sponsor may communicate with the system and thus the user can call directly from the Internet, and it's more convenient to user.

***Response to Arguments***

In the remarks, Applicant(s) argued in substance that

A) Lambert does not disclose URL information of a sponsor for displaying a pre-existing web page concurrently with the listing.

In reply to argument A, Lambert discloses in Fig. 14 showing listee information 1862, sponsor information on the right hand side such as "Shop Online for Computers", "Consumer Guide", etc...are displayed to the user; when the user selects listing "Shoe-Custom Made" on Fig. 14, Fig. 15 displays the selected listing "Shoe-Custom Made" and sponsors such as "Hanger Prosthetics & Orthotics" and "Pedi-Mac Shoe Company". Figures 14 and 15 include frames (framing information), which are active and browseable pre-existing HTML web page having sponsors (embedded hypertext links) on the same page as the sponsoree listing (Fig. 15 and col. 10, lines 12-17).

B) The prior art does not disclose providing a listee of the directory listing with the exclusive right to select a listee web page that is displayed with the directory listing and replaces the sponsor's web page.

In reply to argument B, Applicant's arguments with respect to "providing a listee of the directory listing with the exclusive right to select a listee web page that is displayed with the directory listing and replaces the sponsor's web page" have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as explained here below, necessitated by Applicant's substantial amendment (i.e., providing a listee of the

Art Unit: 2176

directory listing with the exclusive right to select a listee web page that is displayed with the directory listing and replaces the sponsor's web page) to the claims which significantly affected the scope thereof.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4092. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton, can be reached at (571) 272-4137.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. On July 15, 2005, the Central Facsimile (FAX) Number will change from 703-872-9306 to 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chau Nguyen  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2176

*/Doug Hutton/*  
Supervisory Primary Examiner  
Technology Center 2100